



Water Advisory Commission Meeting April 2, 2025

Sean Abbey, Water Quality Specialist



Overview of Results

• 29 responses received

- Out of 103 Santa Cruz County regulated systems (28%)
- The survey opened on March 20th and closed on March 31st
- These responses are intended to inform Santa Cruz County on what resources are desired regarding consolidation
- Our first questions were related to vulnerabilities that might lead a water system to pursue consolidation

Water System vulnerabilities, most to least concerning



- 1 Expanding regulatory requirements
- 2 Aging infrastructure
- 3 Lack of personnel able to work on the system
- 4 Fiscal sustainability
- 5 Loss of water supply
- 6 Degrading water quality

Expanding regulatory	Aging infrastructure	Lack of personnel able to	Fiscal sustainability	Loss of water supply
requirements	1st choice: 7 (24%)	work on the system	1st choice: 2 (7%)	1st choice: 5 (17%)
1st choice: 10 (34%)	2nd choice: 6 (21%)	1st choice: 3 (10%)	2nd choice: 3 (10%)	2nd choice: 1 (3%)
2nd choice: 9 (31%)	3rd choice: 4 (14%)	2nd choice: 8 (28%)	3rd choice: 8 (28%)	3rd choice: 4 (14%)
3rd choice: 8 (28%)	4th choice: 4 (14%)	3rd choice: 4 (14%)	4th choice: 6 (21%)	4th choice: 5 (17%)
4th choice: 1 (3%) 5th choice: 1 (3%)	4th choice: 4 (14%) 5th choice: 3 (10%) 6th choice: 5 (17%)	4th choice: 4 (14%) 5th choice: 3 (10%) 6th choice: 7 (24%)	4th choice: 6 (21%) 5th choice: 7 (24%) 6th choice: 3 (10%)	4th choice: 5 (17%) 5th choice: 9 (31%) 6th choice: 5 (17%)

Degrading water quality		
1st choice:	2 (7%)	
2nd choice:	2 (7%)	
3rd choice:	1 (3%)	
4th choice:	9 (31%)	
5th choice:	6 (21%)	
бth choice:	9 (31%)	

Available Financial reserves







<u>Does your system have more than one source of water?</u>







17

No No

<u>Have you considered installing an Inter-tie?</u>







<u>Would you consider consolidating with another water</u> <u>system?</u>







Consolidation challenges, most to least concerning



- 1 Ability to pay for consolidation work
- 2 Getting your customers consensus to consolidation. This could be due concerns over loss of control,...
- 3 Lack of nearby systems for consolidation
- 4 Staff/volunteer capacity to design and manage consolidation
- 5 Getting the receiving water system to support consolidation

	_	

Ability to pay for consolidation work		
1st choice:	10 (34%)	
2nd choice:	10 (34%)	
3rd choice:	5 (17%)	
4th choice:	4 (14%)	

Getting your customers consensus to consolidation. This could be due concerns		
1st choice:	8 (28%)	
2nd choice:	6 (21%)	
3rd choice:	8 (28%)	
4th choice:	4 (14%)	
5th choice:	3 (10%)	

Lack of nearby systems for consolidation		
1st choice:	9 (31%)	
2nd choice:	4 (14%)	
3rd choice:	6 (21%)	
4th choice:	4 (14%)	
5th choice:	6 (21%)	

Staff/volunteer capacity to design and manage consolidation		
1st choice:	1 (3%)	
2nd choice:	7 (24%)	
3rd choice:	5 (17%)	
4th choice:	6 (21%)	
5th choice:	10 (34%)	

Getting the receiving water system to support consolidation		
1st choice:	1 (3%)	
2nd choice:	2 (7%)	
3rd choice:	5 (17%)	
4th choice:	11 (38%)	
5th choice:	10 (34%)	

<u>Would you consider cost sharing agreements</u> with a nearby water system?







Would you consider another water system or well owner <u>consolidating with your system?</u>

No





<u>Do you believe that your system has the capacity</u> <u>to manage a consolidation project?</u>





<u>Would you be interested in a public agency managing</u> your consolidation project, with your approval?





Valuable Feedback Provided

- 1. Benefits of consolidation are not obvious
- 2. Forced Consolidation "should only be used for systems that cannot provide adequate, safe, clean drinking water".
- 3. Consolidation is extremely expensive with no source of funds unless your system serves low-income households.
- 4. Our by-laws do not allow for additional homes on our system.
- 5. Wildfire exposure is a high-level concern. Mitigation methods are not generally available and those found in the literature are inconsistent.
- 6. Important that the Water Testing Lab in Santa Cruz continues to stay open.



Most responders felt they could not manage a consolidation, but the majority did not feel comfortable with a public agency managing the consolidation.



If you were considering a consolidation, what kind of management assistance would be appealing to your system?

Most responders did not feel comfortable with a public agency acting as a manager for their consolidation.



If you were considering a consolidation, what kind of assistance would your system like from us (Santa Cruz County)?

Most responders would be interested in partnerships with nearby systems to reduce costs.



Would template cost sharing agreements be valuable for your system?

At the State level, the overwhelming majority of "failing" water systems are small (<500 connections). This has led to a state level focus on consolidation of small, failing, water systems as the best long-term solution. As such, the topic of consolidation is often discussed in meetings between the county and the state.

Do you have any feedback you would like us to share with the state on this subject?



Regulatory burden was highly listed as a vulnerability for our water systems.



What specific regulatory burdens are concerning for your system?



<u>What else should we be considering?</u>